

make up for the deficiency, the Office Action asserts that Braun and Rosenberg '613 disclose this feature. It appears that the Office Action further asserts that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill to have incorporated the teaching of Braun and/or Rosenberg '613 into the disclosure of Nishimura. Applicant respectfully disagrees for at least the following three reasons.

First, Braun fails to disclose the above claimed feature. The Office Action asserts that column 22, lines 35-60, of Braun disclose this feature. The relevant sections of Braun disclose the process to determine the output forces. Braun discloses that when a device is determining output forces based on effects, the device checks if the effect is active, calculates the raw contribution to the output force of the effect, scales the force, and adds the scaled contribution to the total sum of forces contributed by all the effects currently being output (column 22, lines 35-60). Braun also discloses that in determining the total sum, the device preferably combines all constant forces and limits the constant force sum to a predetermined magnitude, then combines all dynamic forces and limits the dynamic force sum to a predetermined magnitude...the two sums are then added together (column 22, lines 52-60).

However, Braun fails to disclose assigning the degree of priority to the simulation states or control the vibration in accordance with the priority. Thus, Braun fails to disclose "wherein when a plurality of the vibration occurrence simulation states occur simultaneously as conditions that cause the vibration mechanism to vibrate, the vibration mechanism control section controls the vibration mechanism in accordance with degrees of priority assigned to the simulation states," as recited in claim 1 and similarly recited in claim 8.

Second, Rosenberg '613 fails to disclose above claimed feature. The Office Action asserts that column 16, lines 45-65 of Rosenberg '613 discloses this feature. The relevant sections of Rosenberg '613 disclose the process to modify or shape an initial source wave into a steady state force. Rosenberg '613 discloses that by adding control parameters and impulse

parameters, the source wave is modified or shaped to the steady state force (column 16, lines 45-65). However, column 16, lines 45-65 of Rosenberg '613 does not disclose assigning the degree of priority to the simulation states or control the vibration in accordance with the priority. The rest of Rosenberg '613 is also silent about assigning the degree of priority to the simulation states or controlling the vibration in accordance with the priority. Thus, Rosenberg '613 fails to disclose "wherein when a plurality of the vibration occurrence simulation states occur simultaneously as conditions that cause the vibration mechanism to vibrate, the vibration mechanism control section controls the vibration mechanism in accordance with degrees of priority assigned to the simulation states," as recited in claim 1, and as similarly recited in claim 8.

Because none of the applied references disclose the above feature, the Office Action fails to adequately establish a *prima facie* obviousness rejection. Specifically, the Office Action lacks adequate *Graham v. John Deere* findings of fact concerning the scope and content of the prior art (MPEP §2141(II)) because the applied art taken together does not even disclose all of the claimed features (see MPEP §2143.03). Thus, the Office Action fails to adequately establish a *prima facie* obvious rejection.

Further, the Office Action does not indicate that Rosenberg '674 discloses the above claimed feature. In fact, Rosenberg '674 fails to disclose above claimed feature.

In view of the foregoing, claims 1 and 8 are patentable over Nishimura, Braun, Rosenberg '613 and Rosenberg '674. Further, claims 2-4, 9-11 and 17-22 are patentable for at least the same reasons, as well as for the additional features they recite. Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection.

It is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of the claims are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,

H. Yamashita

James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

Hirotsuna Yamashita
Registration No. L0563

JAO:HQY/jnm

Attachment:
Petition for Extension of Time

Date: September 15, 2009

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 320850
Alexandria, Virginia 22320-4850
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461
--